

Docket No. E-01933A-15-0100

ORIGINAL



0000163403

Chairwoman Susan Bitter Smith
Commissioner Bob Stump
Commissioner Bob Burns
Commissioner Tom Forese
Commissioner Doug Little

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 10 2015

DOCKETED BY

DAB

RECEIVED

2015 JUN 10 P 4:05

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Thank you, and apologies for my limitations.

I am severely disabled (Title VI SSDI, status: "terminal" in federal terms). I do not have an income beyond a monthly disability check. I have no pension, no retirement fund, no investment portfolio. I have been unable to work most of my life. One of my many disabilities is that I am chemically sensitive to the extent that I cannot live in low income housing and must move periodically from market-price rentals which also sicken me.

Becoming a homeowner is the one hope I have of finally being able to control environmental quality to the point where I can enjoy some quality of life. Budgeting for solar power installation has been integral to my search for a house. Solar power is clean energy, gives back to the community, and will, in the long run save money that I desperately need to for other basic necessities. Because I cannot get a mortgage, I am throwing everything I have -- an inheritance that has been earmarked for this purpose -- into the purchase of a house, cash. I will not have much left over, but shelter is basic and necessary. I have to do this.

I have been a TEP customer for a little over five months (two different addresses). Tucson has had a relatively cool spring and early summer, but if there are TEP officials present, I would ask them to look at the electrical usage on my account which is listed on my billing statements as R-01-Residential Lifeline Discount (Service No. 7547285421).

Currently it is 92 degrees Fahrenheit in my apartment, four degrees hotter than the air outdoors. Why? Because I can't open the windows wide enough for proper air flow and cannot afford to use air-conditioning. When I become a homeowner, my usage pattern won't change that much because I have adapted to living without. In fact, I anticipate even lower usage because, as a homeowner, I will have even less to work with. When income is insufficient to meet needs, priorities become very, very clear.

That the ACC would even consider TEP's current proposal comes as an outrage to a customer who lives below the poverty line, whose usage is low, and whose plans for being able to manage fiscally over the longterm include installation of solar technology.

I can appreciate that TEP has an electrical grid to patch, maintain and upgrade, and that the money to keep the current flowing to all of us has to come from somewhere. It's a reasonable expectation on TEP's part that anyone who uses the grid should pay for the privilege. I can appreciate why, with an increasing number of customers able to generate their electrical power, TEP would view solar customers as a business threat and feel they have the right to penalize such customers for eroding their bottom line. And I especially can see why TEP feels solar customers "owe" them -- for reduced revenues coming in and increased payments flowing out -- when product delivery, back and forth, is still happening on the grid.

1341217

I don't mean to disparage the wonderful service that instant electrical power at the touch of a button affords. It is a privilege no one of us can entirely do without. It is how this letter flows out to you from me, thanks to the generosity of our public library system.

But is not fair to take the product someone else's money has "earned" without one-for-one remuneration. Even if that product is delivered and redistributed through a common pipeline, those who are adding to the system's resources should not be asked to shoulder more expense.

It ought to be considered that solar customers are *reducing* TEP's costs in other ways. They are quietly supplying product to TEP at low cost. They are reducing TEP's need to turn to other more expensive, more environmentally depleting sources. They are using the grid *less* than the non-solar customer and they are forcing much-needed change on a business monopoly that will *have* to change its ways in the future to survive.

How can *further* taxation of extremely costly investments the few are making to reduce overall consumption of the planet's resources be justified? Shouldn't there be a limit to what forward-thinking, fiscally responsible people should be asked to pay for? And how fair is it to reduce payments and institute a tax for some solar customers but not others? Shouldn't we be thinking about a reward system for doing what is responsible and right, regardless of when someone signs on to do it? The assumption that customers "wealthy" enough to install solar are wealthy enough to pay an extra tariff is absurd when you consider there is at least one person -- me -- who will be installing solar technology for the specific reason that I *cannot afford to pay for normal usage, even with a discounted electrical service plan.*

I hardly think a company that extracts a \$50 deposit and \$22+ service charge from every single customer to *initiate* service, and another \$22+ service charge to *switch* an account to another address (talk about push button technology!) should be complaining about their revenue stream!

In an era where more and more people are seeking independence of the grid, it seems to me TEP could find much better ways of working with customers instead of against them. Isn't it time for a new business model rather than just a new way to nickel and dime?

Sincerely yours,

Elsie J. Ermenc
P.O. Box 42054
Tucson, AZ 85733-2054